

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 7, 9-11, 12, and 14-16 are currently pending. Claims 7 and 12, which are independent, are amended. Support for the amendment is provided throughout the Specification, specifically at pages 16 and 22.

No new matter has been introduced. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 7, 9-11, 12 and 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6772433 to LaJoie¹ (hereinafter, merely “LaJoie”) in view of “DVB Document A038: Specification for service information (SI) in Digital Video Broadcasting (DVB) Systems” (hereinafter, merely “DVB A038”) and further in view of “Digital Video

¹ U.S. Publication No. 2005/0015804A1 cited in the Office Action was published on January 20, 2005, which is later than Applicants’ filing date, which is September 8, 2000. U.S. Publication No. 2005/0015894A1 is a continuation of application No. 09/185179, filed on November 3, 1998, now U.S. Patent No. 6772433. Thus, U.S. Patent No. 6772433 is used as the reference, replacing U.S. Publication No. 2005/0015804A1, in this paper.

Broadcasting (DVB); Guidelines on implementation and usage of Service Information (SI),
ETR211” (hereinafter, merely “DVB ETR211”).

III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 7 recites, *inter alia*:

“An information transmission apparatus...

... wherein said first delivery system descriptor length and said second delivery system descriptor length are set in accordance with a transport stream descriptor length,

wherein service identifiers of network information that are not retransmitted are deleted and placeholder data that has the same length of the deleted service identifiers is added”
(emphasis added)

The Office Action (see page 4) concedes that “LaJoie is silent on the steps of replacing network information means prior to transmitting the data to a cable delivery network and deleting the service identifiers of network information that are not retransmitted and adding placeholder data for the deleted service identifiers, the service list descriptors for services repeated in the new transmission in the cable delivery network in accordance with the TS descriptor length.” The Office Action (see page 4-6) further relies on DVB A038 and DVB ETR211 to reject the above-identified features of claim 7.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of DVB A038 and DVB ETR211 fail to disclose or suggest “wherein said first delivery system descriptor length and said second delivery system descriptor length are set in accordance with a transport stream descriptor length” and “wherein service identifiers of network information that are not retransmitted are deleted and placeholder data that has the same length of the deleted service identifiers is added”, (emphasis added), as cited in claim 7.

Firs the Office Action (see page 4-5) relies on 4.11, 5.3, and 4.2.1.2.1 of DVB ETR211 and 6.2.8 and pages 14-15 of DVB A038 to reject “wherein said first delivery system descriptor length and said second delivery system descriptor length are set in accordance with a transport stream descriptor length”, as recited in claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that DVB ETR 211 discloses to include delivery system descriptors but fails to teach or suggest the length of these descriptors. Applicants submit that pages 14-15 of DVB A038, as cited by the Office Action, disclose transport-descriptor-length but fail to disclose or suggest that delivery system descriptor length is related with the transport-descriptor-length. Applicants submit that DVB ETR211 and DVB A038 fail to disclose or suggest the above-identified features of claim 7.

Second, the Office Action (see page 5) relies on table 62 and table 66 of DVB A038 to reject “wherein service identifiers of network information that are not retransmitted are deleted and placeholder data that has the same length of the deleted service identifiers is added”, as recited in claim 7 (emphasis added). Specifically, the Office Action cites “repetition of the stuffing-byte field” and “each occurrence of field maybe set to any value” to teach the above-identified features of claim 7. Applicants respectfully submit that the repetition in table 66 is for each stuffing descriptor that invalidates one previously corresponding code descriptor. Meaning of repetition is also evidenced in table 62 that each repetition is for one service list descriptor. Comparing table 62 and table 66, Applicants respectfully submit that each service list descriptor has 24 bits (16 bits for service_id and 8 bits for service_type) in direct contrast with the stuffing descriptor of 8 bits (stuffing_byte) in table 66. Applicants further submit that DVB A308’s “each occurrence of the field may be set to any value” means that the actual content expressed by the field of stuffing-byte can be any value and does NOT mean that the length of the

stuffing_byte can be any value. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that DVB A308 fails to teach or suggest the above-identified features of claim 7.

Applicants respectfully submit that LaJoie, DVB A038, and DVB ETR211, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the cited features in claim 7. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 7 is patentable.

Claim 7 recites, *inter alia*:

“An information transmission apparatus...

wherein a table containing physical information of a transmission path is contained in the broadcasting signal and is distinguished by a unique table ID,” (emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that LaJoie, DVB A038, and DVB ETR211, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest wherein a table containing physical information of a transmission path is contained in the broadcasting signal and is distinguished by a unique table ID, as recited in claim 7. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 7 is patentable.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 7, amended independent claim 12 is also patentable.

Therefore, independent claims 7 and 12 are patentable.

IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims are dependent from one of the independent claims, discussed above, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent

claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION


In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portion or portions of the reference or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800